



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/955,361	09/18/2001	Fuad Rashid	M-11649 US	9514
33031	7590 12/15/2005	•	EXAMINER	
	L STEPHENSON AS	STORK, KYLE R		
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	09/955,361	RASHID ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kyle R. Stork	2178			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 Seconds</u> This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-20,22-39,41-58 and 60-77 is/are part 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,20,39,58 and 77 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3-19,22-38,41-57 and 60-76 is/are ob 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accertain and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction and sheet(s) including the corr	vn from consideration. jected to. r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application tity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/955,361

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

1. This non-final office action is in response to the amendments filed with the continued examination filed 2 September 2005.

2. Claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58, and 60-77 are pending. Claims 2, 21, 40, and 59 are cancelled by the amendment. Claim 77 is newly added. The rejection of claims 1, 3-20, 22-39, 41-58, and 60-76 under 35 U.S.C. 103 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Specification

3. Dependent claims 3-19, 22-38, 41-57, and 60-76 are dependent upon cancelled claims. These are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1, 20, 39, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack et al. (US 2002/0054115, filed 11 June 2001, hereafter Mack)

Application/Control Number: 09/955,361

Art Unit: 2178

and further in view of Adobe® GoLive™ 5.0 User Guide (Adobe, 2000, hereafter Adobe).

As per independent claim 1, Mack discloses a method comprising:

- Selecting a tag field-based view comprising one or more applets (paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0024)
- Migrating a Cartesian coordinate-based view to the tag field-based view, wherein the migration comprises:
 - o Identifying a first applet of the one or more applets wherein the first applet comprises one or more controls (paragraphs 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, a Java applet is identified to be converted to XML)
 - Associating a first applet template with the first applet, wherein the first applet template comprises one or more characteristics of each of the one or more controls (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024: Here, twin servlets acts as templates, converting Java applets to XML, and conversely, converting XML back to Java applets)
 - Linking the first applet template to a corresponding first Cartesian view applet in the Cartesian coordinate-based view, wherein the first Cartesian view applet comprises a Cartesian view control (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024)
 - Mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag field-based view
 (paragraph s 0019-0020 and 0024)

Mack fails to specifically disclose modifying the Cartesian view control to produce a corresponding tag view control, wherein said modifying matches characteristics of an associated control of the one or more controls in the first template. However, Adobe discloses adding control buttons to tag-based view (pages 306-307). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack's method of converting applets to tag-based views with Adobe's method of adding control buttons to a tag-based view, since it would have allowed a user to interact with the tag-based data (Adobe: page 306).

As per independent claims 20, 39, 58, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 20, 39, and 58 are similarly rejected under Mack and Adobe.

6. Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mack and Adobe and further in view of "XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0" (16 November 1999, w3c.org, hereafter XSL).

As per dependent claim 77, Mack and Adobe disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Mack fails to specifically disclose associating a tag field-based view template with the tag field-based view and mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag-field-based template. However, XSL discloses associating a tag field-based view template with the tag field-based view and mapping the corresponding tag view control to the tag-field-based template (sections 1 and 5.4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mack and Adobe with XSL, since it would have allowed a user to process and format tag-based data (XSL: section 1).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 20, 39, 58, and 77 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As disclosed above, the Mack, Adobe, and XSL references have been added to address the amended claim limitations.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/955,361

Art Unit: 2178

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

CÈSAR PAULA PRIMARY EXAMINER